



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,134	09/12/2003	John E. Harrold	SWD-127A	7745

7590

06/27/2005

Kenneth P. Glynn, Esq.
Glynn & Associates, P.C.
24 Mine Street
Flemington, NJ 08822

EXAMINER

DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,134

Applicant(s)

HARROLD, JOHN E.

Examiner

PHILIPPE S. DERAQSHANI

Art Unit

3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12, 14, 15 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 6, 7, 13, 16 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 4 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is over 150 words.
Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 11, line 18 the reference for the sidewall is not 13. Figure 1 shows 13 is part of the latching system.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-12, 14-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Tauber and Adams et al.

Montgomery shows a safety cap comprising a base element 54, cap 10, latching system 19, 64 and spring 20. Montgomery lacks the base element having a container tube attachment mechanism. Tauber shows a base element 44 having a tube attachment mechanism 60 to facilitate manufacturing of a container. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Montgomery base element with a tube attachment mechanism as taught by Tauber to facilitate manufacturing of a container.

Montgomery lacks the cap having a lower portion including a downward extension of the sidewall. Adams et al show a cap having a lower extension 93 to seal against the shoulder of the container. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Montgomery cap with a lower extension as taught by Adams et al to seal against the shoulder of the container.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 6-7, 13 and 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Towns and DeJonge were cited to show further examples of caps.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAESHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on 571-272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PHILIPPE S DERAQSHANI
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3754

PD
6/23/05

 f 23-05